

# OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION

65 East State Street, Suite 312  
Columbus, Ohio 43215  
(614) 466-0880

## APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Revised 6/90

CB 707

**IMPORTANT:** Applicant should consult the "Instructions for Completion of Project Application" for assistance in the proper completion of this form.

**APPLICANT NAME  
STREET**

VILLAGE OF FAIRFAX

Municipal Building  
5903 Hawthorne Avenue

**CITY/ZIP**

Fairfax, OH 45227

**PROJECT NAME  
PROJECT TYPE  
TOTAL COST**

WOOSTER PIKE STORM SEWER REPLACEMENT

STORM SEWER

\$ 381,600

**DISTRICT NUMBER  
COUNTY**

TWO

HAMILTON

**PROJECT LOCATION ZIP CODE**

45227

02 DEC 17 AM 11

### DISTRICT FUNDING RECOMMENDATION

To be completed by the District Committee ONLY

**RECOMMENDED AMOUNT OF FUNDING:**

\$ 343,400.00

### FUNDING SOURCE (Check Only One):

State Issue 2 District Allocation

☒ Grant

☐ Loan

☐ Loan Assistance

State Issue 2 Small Government Fund

State Issue 2 Emergency Funds

Local Transportation Improvement Fund

FOR OPWC USE ONLY

OPWC PROJECT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

OPWC FUNDING AMOUNT: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

## 1.0 APPLICANT INFORMATION

1.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
OFFICER  
TITLE  
STREET

Theodore Shannon, Jr.  
Mayor

5903 Hawthorne Avenue  
Municipal Building  
Fairfax, OH 45227

CITY/ZIP  
PHONE  
FAX

( 513 ) 271 - 7707  
( 513 ) 271 - 4178

1.2 CHIEF FINANCIAL  
OFFICER  
TITLE  
STREET

Ms. Kathryn L. Rielage  
Clerk/Treasurer  
5903 Hawthorne Avenue

Municipal Building  
Fairfax, OH 45227

CITY/ZIP  
PHONE  
FAX

( 513 ) 271 - 7012  
( 513 ) 271 - 4178

1.3 PROJECT MGR  
TITLE  
STREET

J. Timothy King, PE-PS  
Village Engineer  
J. T. KING & CO. INC.

9122 Montgomery Road  
Cincinnati, OH 45242

CITY/ZIP  
PHONE  
FAX

( 513 ) 793- - 7667  
( 513 ) 985 - 3559

1.4 PROJECT CONTACT  
TITLE  
STREET

Ms. Kathryn L. Rielage  
Clerk/Treasurer  
Municipal Building  
5903 Hawthorne Avenue

Fairfax, OH 45227

CITY/ZIP  
PHONE  
FAX

( 513 ) 271 - 7012  
( 513 ) 271 - 4178

1.5 DISTRICT LIAISON  
TITLE  
STREET

William W. Brayshaw, PE-PS  
Hamilton County Engineer  
138 East Court Street  
Cincinnati, OH 45202

CITY/ZIP  
PHONE  
FAX

( 513 ) 632 - 8691  
( 513 ) 723 - 9748

## 2.0 PROJECT INFORMATION

**IMPORTANT:** If project is multi-jurisdictional in nature, information must be consolidated for completion of this section.

2.1 **PROJECT NAME:** WOOSTER PIKE STORM SEWER REPLACEMENT

2.2 **BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION - (Sections A through D):**  
**A. SPECIFIC LOCATION:**

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

**B. PROJECT COMPONENTS:**

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

**C. PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS/CHARACTERISTICS:**

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

**D. DESIGN SERVICE CAPACITY:**

**IMPORTANT:** Detail shall be included regarding current service capacity vs proposed service level. If road or bridge project, include ADT. If water or wastewater project include current residential rates based on monthly usage of 7,756 gallons per household.

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

2.3 **REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

(Photographs/Additional Description; Capital Improvements Report; Priority List 5-year Plan; 2-year Maintenance of Effort report, etc.) Also discuss the number of temporary and/or fulltime jobs which are likely to be created as a result of this project. Attach Pages. Refer to accompanying instructions for further detail.

FILE: FAIRFAX\WP.I2

#### 2.2.A. SPECIFIC LOCATION

THIS PROJECT IS LOCATED IN AND ALONG WOOSTER PIKE BEGINNING AT OLD WOOSTER PIKE AND EXTENDING EASTWARDLY APPROXIMATELY 2300 LINEAR FEET TO CAMDEN AVENUE-THE CORPORATE LIMIT OF FAIRFAX.

#### 2.2.B. PROJECT COMPONENTS

THIS PROJECT WILL CONSIST OF REPLACING AN EXISTING STORM SEWER SYSTEM WITH NEW CONDUIT VARYING IN SIZE FROM TWELVE (12) INCHES TO TWENTY-FOUR (24) INCHES IN DIAMETER. THE CONDUIT WILL REPLACE THE EXISTING CORRUGATED METAL PIPE CONDUIT WHICH DIRECTS RUNOFF FROM WOOSTER PIKE TO THE RECEIVING CONDUIT ON OLD WOOSTER PIKE. THE PROPOSED STORM SEWER WILL REPLACE THE EXISTING CONDUIT IN BOTH LOCATION AND SIZE.

EXISTING CATCHBASINS, MANHOLES AND ASSOCIATED PIPING WILL BE REPLACED, ALSO.

#### 2.2.C. PHYSICAL DIMENSIONS/CHARACTERISTICS

THE EXISTING STORM SEWER SYSTEM IS CONSTRUCTED OF CORRUGATED METAL PIPE THAT IS EXTREMELY CORRODED AND SLIGHTLY UNDER CAPACITY.

THE PROPOSED STORM SEWER TO BE PLACED IN THE STREET WILL REPLACE THE EXISTING CONDUIT WHICH IS LOCATED BENEATH THE PEDESTRIAN WALKS. IT WILL BE NECESSARY TO REPLACE EXISTING WALKS AND A SMALL AMOUNT OF AMOUNT OF CURBING.

THE EXISTING STORM SEWER IS APPROXIMATELY 40 PLUS YEAR OLD. AGE, SOIL CONDITIONS AND DE-ICING SALTS ARE RAPIDLY DETERIORATING THIS STORM SEWER SYSTEM.

#### 2.1.D. DESIGN SERVICE CAPACITY

THE PROPOSED SERVICE CAPACITY OF THE PROPOSED STORM SEWER SYSTEM WILL BE OF SOMEWHAT GREATER CAPACITY THAN THE EXISTING SYSTEM BUT WILL CONSIST OF THE SAME SIZE CONDUITS. THE REASON FOR THIS INCREASED SERVICE CAPACITY RESULTING FROM THE SAME SIZE PIPE IS BECAUSE OF SMOOTHER INTERIOR PIPE SURFACE, NO DETERIORATION AND BETTER OVERALL HYDRAULIC CAPACITY OF THE PROPOSED CONDUITS.

### 3.0 PROJECT FINANCIAL INFORMATION

#### 3.1 PROJECT ESTIMATED COSTS (Round to Nearest Dollar):

a)	Project Engineering Costs:	
	1. Preliminary Engineering	\$ <u>N/A</u>
	2. Final Design	\$ <u>N/A</u>
	3. Construction Supervision	\$ <u>N/A</u>
b)	Acquisition Expenses	
	1. Land	\$ <u>N/A</u>
	2. Right-of-Way	\$ <u>N/A</u>
c)	Construction Costs	\$ <u>318,000</u>
d)	Equipment Costs	\$ <u>n/a</u>
e)	Other Direct Expenses	\$ <u>n/a</u>
f)	Contingencies	\$ <u>63,600</u>
g)	<b>TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS</b>	\$ <u>381,600</u>

#### 3.2 PROJECT FINANCIAL RESOURCES (Round to Nearest Dollar and Percent)

		Dollars	%
a)	Local In-Kind Contributions *	\$ _____	_____
b)	Local Public Revenues ✓	\$ <u>38,200</u>	<u>10</u>
c)	Local Private Revenues	\$ _____	_____
d)	Other Public Revenues		
	1. ODOT	\$ _____	_____
	2. FMHA	\$ _____	_____
	3. OEPA	\$ _____	_____
	4. OWDA	\$ _____	_____
	5. CDBG	\$ _____	_____
	6. Other _____	\$ _____	_____
e)	OPWC Funds		
	1. Grant ✓	\$ <u>343,400</u>	<u>90</u>
	2. Loan	\$ _____	_____
	3. Loan Assistance	\$ _____	_____
f)	<b>TOTAL FINANCIAL RESOURCES</b>	\$ <u>381,600</u>	<u>100</u>

\* If the required local match is to be 100% In-Kind Contributions, list source of funds to be used for retainage purposes:

#### 3.3 AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL FUNDS

Indicate the status of all local share funding sources listed in section 3.2(a) through 3.4(c). In addition, if funds are coming from sources listed in section 3.2(d), the following information must be attached to this project application:

- 1) The date funds are available;
- 2) Verification of funds in the form of an agency approval letter or agency project number. Please include the name and number of the agency contact person.

### 3.4 PREPAID ITEMS

#### Definitions:

Cost -	Total Cost of the Prepaid Item.
Cost Item -	Non-construction costs, including preliminary engineering, final design, acquisition expenses (land or right-of-way).
Prepaid -	Cost Items (non-construction costs directly related to the project) paid prior to receipt of fully executed Project Agreement from OPWC.
Resource Category -	Source of funds (see section 3.2).
Verification -	Invoice(s) and copies of warrant(s) used to for prepaid cost accompanied by Project Manager's Certification (see section 1.4)

**IMPORTANT:** Verification of all prepaid items shall be attached to this project application

	<u>COST ITEM</u>	<u>RESOURCE CATEGORY</u>	<u>COST</u>
1)	n/a		\$
2)	n/a		\$
3)	n/a		\$
TOTAL OF PREPAID ITEMS			\$ N/A

### 3.5 REPAIR/REPLACEMENT or NEW/EXPANSION

This section need only be completed if the Project is to be funded by SI2 funds:

TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT REPAIR/REPLACEMENT	\$ 381,600.00	100 %
State Issue 2 Funds for Repair/Replacement (Not to Exceed 90%)	\$ 343,400.00	90
TOTAL PORTION OF PROJECT NEW/EXPANSION	\$	%
State Issue 2 Funds for New/Expansion (Not to Exceed 50%)	\$	

### 4.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE

	ESTIMATED START DATE	ESTIMATED COMPLETE DATE
4.1 ENGR. DESIGN	2 / 1 / 93	4 / 30 / 93
4.2 BID PROCESS	6 / 20 / 93	7 / 20 / 93
4.3 CONSTRUCTION	8 / 30 / 93	12 / 30 / 93

## 5.0 APPLICANT CERTIFICATION

The Applicant Certifies That:

As the official representative of the Applicant, the undersigned certifies that: (1) he/she is legally empowered to represent the applicant in both requesting and accepting financial assistance as provided under Chapter 164 of the Ohio Revised Code and 164-1 of the Ohio Administrative Code; (2) that to the best of his/her knowledge and belief, all representations that are a part of this application are true and correct; (3) that all official documents and commitments of the applicant that are a part of this application have been duly authorized by the governing body of the Applicant; (4) and, should the requested financial assistance be provided, that in the execution of this project, the Applicant will comply with all assurances required by Ohio law, including those involving minority business utilization, Buy Ohio, and prevailing wages.

**IMPORTANT:** Applicant certifies that physical construction on the project as defined in this application has not begun, and will not begin, until a Project Agreement on this project has been issued by the Ohio Public Works Commission. Action to the contrary is evidence that OPWC funds are not necessary to complete this project.

**IMPORTANT:** In the event of a project cost overrun, applicant understands that the identified local match share (sections 3.2(a) through 3.2(c)) will be paid in full toward completion of this project. Unneeded OPWC funds will be returned to the funding source from which the project was financed.

Theodore Shannon, Jr., Mayor & Ms. Kathryn L. Rielage, Clerk/Treasurer  
Certifying Representative (Type Name and Title)

Theodore Shannon Jr 12-16-92 Kathryn L. Rielage  
Signature/Date Signed

Applicant shall check each of the statements below, confirming that all required information is included in this application:

- |          |            |   |
|----------|------------|---|
| <u>X</u> |            | A five-year Capital Improvements Report as required in 164-1-31 of the Ohio Administrative Code and a <u>two-year Maintenance of Local Effort Report</u> as required in 164-1-12 of the Ohio Administrative Code. |
| <u>X</u> |            | A registered professional engineer's estimate of useful life as required in 164-1-13 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimate shall contain engineer's <u>original seal and signature</u> .                      |
| <u>X</u> |            | A registered professional engineer's estimate of cost as required in 164-1-14 and 164-1-16 of the Ohio Administrative Code. Estimate shall contain engineer's <u>original seal and signature</u> .                |
| <u>X</u> |            | A certified copy of the legislation by the governing body of the applicant authorizing a designated official to submit this application and to execute contracts.   |
| <u>X</u> | YES<br>N/A | A copy of the cooperation agreement(s) (for projects involving more than one subdivision or district).  |
| <u>X</u> | YES<br>N/A | Copies of all invoices and warrants for those items identified as "pre-paid" in section 4.4 of this application.  |

## 6.0 DISTRICT COMMITTEE CERTIFICATION

The District Integrating Committee for District Number 2 Certifies That:

As the official representative of the District Public Works Integrating Committee, the undersigned hereby certifies: that this application for financial assistance as provided under Chapter 164 of the Ohio Revised Code has been duly selected by the appropriate body of the District Public Works Integrating Committee; that the project's selection was based entirely on an objective, District-oriented set of project evaluation criteria and selection methodology that are fully reflective of and in conformance with Ohio Revised Code Sections 164.05, 164.06, and 164.14, and Chapter 164-1 of the Ohio Administrative Code; and that the amount of financial assistance hereby recommended has been prudently derived in consideration of all other financial resources available to the project. As evidence of the District's due consideration of required project evaluation criteria, the results of this project's ratings under such criteria are attached to this application.

William W. Brayshaw, Chairman, District 2 Integrating Committee  
Certifying Representative (Type Name and Title)

William W. Brayshaw 3-1-93  
Signature/Date Signed



FILE: WP-I2.WK1


PRINTER=12

WOOSTER PIKE STORM SEWER REPLACEMENT  
VILLAGE OF FAIRFAX, OHIO

\*\*\*\*\* ENGINEER'S ESTIMATE\*\*\*\*\*


ITEM NO.	DESCRIPTION	UNIT	EST. QUAN.	UNIT COST (\$)			TOTAL COST(\$)
				MATL.	LABOR	TOTAL	
207	TEMPORARY EROSION CONTROL	LS	1	\$	\$	1,000	1,000
253	PAVEMENT REMOVAL	SY	9200	\$	\$	2.25	20,700
403	ASPHALTIC CONCRETE	CY	510	\$	\$	95	48,450
404	ASPHALTIC CONCRETE	CY	255	\$	\$	95	24,225
603	CONDUIT, TYPE "B", 12"	LF	480	\$	\$	45	21,600
603	CONDUIT, TYPE "B", 15"	LF	600	\$	\$	65	39,000
603	CONDUIT, TYPE "B", 18"	LF	600	\$	\$	80	48,000
603	CONDUIT, TYPE "B", 24"	LF	700	\$	\$	95	66,500
604	MANHOLE, MH-1	EA	9	\$	\$	2,000	18,000
604	CATCHBASIN, CB 2-3A	EA	18	\$	\$	1,200	21,600
609	CURBING, CONCRETE	LF	200	\$	\$	15	3,000
614	MAINTAINING TRAFFIC	LS	1	\$	\$	3,000	3,000
623	CONSTRUCTION LAYOUT STAKES	LS	1	\$	\$	3,000	3,000
TOTAL.....							1318,075
							=====
SAY.....							\$318,000
							=====

THE ESTIMATED LIFE OF THIS PROJECT IS TWENTY (20) YEARS.



A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. Timothy King".

J. TIMOTHY KING, PE,PS  
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER  
OHIO REGISTRATION NO. 40801



#### ROAD CLASSIFICATION

Heavy-duty	—————	Light-duty	—————
Medium-duty	———	Unimproved dirt	.....
Interstate Route	—————	U.S. Route	—————
		State Route	—————


CINCINNATI EAST, OHIO

N3907.5—W8422.5/7.5

ISSUE TWO APPLICATION  
WOOSTER PIKE  
STORM SEWER REPLACEMENT  
VILLAGE OF FAIRFAX

1961  
PHOTOREVISED 1970 AND 1974  
AMS 4162 III NW—SERIES V852

(WITHAMSVILLE)  
4162 III SE



ISSUE TWO APPLICATION  
WOOSTER PIKE  
STORM SEWER REPLACEMENT  
VILLAGE OF FAIRFAX  
DECEMBER 1992

RESOLUTION R6 -1992

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR AND THE CLERK-TREASURER TO FILE AN APPLICATION WITH THE OHIO PUBLIC WORKS COMMISSION FOR STATE ISSUE II FUNDS, AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY

WHEREAS, storm sewer repairs are a priority of the Village of Fairfax; and,

WHEREAS, the Ohio Revised Code has allowed for the issuance of State Issue II funds for 1992; and,

WHEREAS, the District Public Works Integrating Committee of Hamilton County (DPWIC) is the recipient of State Issue II funds in the amount of \$8,956,000 from the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC); and,

WHEREAS, the Village of Fairfax will apply for funding under State Issue II as part of District 2 (Hamilton County) allocation for storm sewer repairs and improvements.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Council of the Village of Fairfax, Ohio:


SECTION I: That the Council of the Village of Fairfax does hereby endorse and support the application for State Issue II funds for repairs and improvements to the storm sewers on both Old Wooster Pike and Wooster Pike within the Village of Fairfax.

SECTION II: That the Mayor and the Clerk-Treasurer are hereby authorized and directed to file an application with the District Public Works Integrating Committee of Hamilton County (DPWIC) for Ohio Public Works Commission funding under State Issue II for 1992, and if awarded to implement said program.

SECTION III: That the Village of Fairfax hereby requests the District Public Works Integrating Committee (DPWIC) and the Ohio Public Works Commission (OPWC) to consider and fund the referenced application.

SECTION IV: That this <sup>Resolution</sup>~~Ordinance~~ is hereby declared to be an emergency measure necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, safety and general welfare and shall be effective immediately. The reason for said declaration of emergency is the immediate necessity of Council's approval for applying for Issue II funds with the period of application.


Passed this 16th day of December, 1992.

  
MAYOR

ATTEST:

  
CLERK-TREASURER

I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of Resolution B6 -1992 passed at a meeting of the Council of the Village of Fairfax on the sixteenth day of December, 1992.



*Village  
of  
Fairfax*

*Office of the Clerk-Treasurer*

5903 Hawthorne St.  
Fairfax (Cincinnati,) Ohio 45227  
Phone: 271-7012

March 24, 1993

Hamilton County Engineers  
138 East Court Street  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Attn.: Mr. Joe Cottrill

Dear Mr. Cottrill:


Please accept this letter as documentation that the Village of Fairfax has the following monies for Issue II Projects:

\$38,200 for Wooster Pike Storm Sewers

\$34,700 for Old Wooster Pike Storm Sewer Replacement

Please be advised that we will be appropriating these monies in 1994 for the aforementioned projects. Please contact me if you need anything further.

Cordially,

  
Kathryn L. Rielage

## 2.3 REQUIRED SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

### FIVE YEAR PLAN FOR THE VILLAGE OF FAIRFAX

1992	RED BANK ROAD BRIDGE No. FAI-049 SUPERSTRUCTURE REMOVAL & REPLACEMENT.....	\$410,000
	RED BANK ROAD BRIDGE No. FAI-069 SUPERSTRUCTURE REPAIRS.....	\$45,000
1993	WOOSTER PIKE STORM SEWER RECONSTRUCTION AND CURB REPAIR.....	\$318,000
1993	OLD WOOSTER PIKE STORM SEWER RECONSTRUCTION.....	\$289,000
1994	OLD WOOSTER PIKE BRIDGE OVER CSX RAILROAD REPLACEMENT.....	\$1,000,000
1995	MURRAY ROAD JOINT REPAIR & RESURFACING.....	\$100,000
1996	RED BANK ROAD WIDENING.....	\$1,500,000

### TWO YEAR MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

1991	VILLAGE WIDE CURB REMOVAL & REPLACEMENT PROJECT.....	\$278,000
1991	SOUTHERN AVENUE STORM SEWER IMPROVEMENT.....	\$9,000
1990	HIGH STREET RECONSTRUCTION.....	\$40,000

THE PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF THE STORM SEWER SYSTEM WILL RESULT IN APPROXIMATELY 10 FULL TIME JOBS WITH APPROXIMATELY 6 TEMPORARY JOBS.

## 3.3 AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL FUNDS

LOCAL FUNDS HAVE BEEN ALLOCATED FOR THIS PROJECT AND ARE AVAILABLE IMMEDIATELY.



## ADDITIONAL SUPPORT INFORMATION

For Fiscal Year 1993, jurisdictions shall complete the State application form for Issue 2, Small Government, or Local Transportation Improvement Program (LTIP) funding. In addition, the District 2 Integrating Committee requests the following information to determine which projects are funded. Information provided on both forms should be accurate, based on reliable engineering principles. Do NOT request a specific type of funding desired, as this is decided by the District Integrating Committee.

1. Of the total infrastructure within the jurisdiction which is similar to the infrastructure of this project, what percentage can be classified as being in poor condition, adequacy and/or serviceability? Accurate support information, such as pavement management inventories or bridge condition summaries, must be provided to substantiate the stated percentage.

Typical examples are:

Road percentage=  $\frac{\text{Miles of road that are in poor condition}}{\text{Total miles of road within jurisdiction}}$

Storm percentage=  $\frac{\text{Miles of storm sewers that are in poor condition}}{\text{Total miles of storm sewers within jurisdiction}}$

Bridge percentage=  $\frac{\text{Number of bridges that are in poor condition}}{\text{Number of bridges within jurisdiction}}$

0.81 miles in poor condition/3.2 total miles of storm sewer

=25%

2. What is the condition of the existing infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded? For bridges, submit a copy of the latest general appraisal and condition rating.

Closed \_\_\_\_\_

Poor   X  

Fair \_\_\_\_\_

Good \_\_\_\_\_

Give a brief statement of the nature of the deficiency of the present facility such as: inadequate load capacity (bridge); surface type and width; number of lanes; structural condition; substandard design elements such as berm width, grades, curves, sight distances, drainage structures, or inadequate service capacity. If known, give the approximate age of the infrastructure to be replaced, repaired, or expanded.

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

3. If State Issue 2 funds are awarded, how soon (in weeks or months) after completion of the agreement with OPWC would the opening of bids occur? The Integrating Committee will be reviewing schedules submitted for previous projects to help judge the accuracy of a particular jurisdiction's anticipated schedule.

5 months

Please indicate the current status of the project development by circling the appropriate answers below. PROVIDE ACCURATE ESTIMATE.

- |  |            |           |            |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|
| a) Has the Consultant been selected?.....            | <u>Yes</u> | No        | N/A        |
| b) Preliminary development or engineering completed? | Yes        | <u>No</u> | N/A        |
| c) Detailed construction plans completed?.....       | Yes        | <u>No</u> | N/A        |
| d) All right-of-way and easements acquired?.....     | Yes        | No        | <u>N/A</u> |
| e) Utility coordination completed?.....              | Yes        | <u>No</u> | N/A        |

Give estimate of time, in weeks or months, to complete any item above not yet completed.

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

4. How will the proposed infrastructure activity impact the general health, welfare, and safety of the service area? (Typical examples include the effects of the completed project on accident rates, emergency response time, fire protection, health hazards, user benefits, and commerce.)

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

5. For any project involving GRANTS, the local jurisdiction must provide a MINIMUM OF 10% of the anticipated construction cost. Additionally, the local jurisdiction must pay 100% of the costs of preliminary engineering, inspection, and right-of-way. If a project is to be funded under Issue 2 or Small Government, the costs of any betterment/expansion are 100% local. Local matching funds must either be currently on deposit with the jurisdiction, or certified as having been approved or encumbered by an outside agency (MRF, CDBG, etc.). Proposed funding must be shown on the Project Application under Section 3.2, "Project Financial Resources". For a project involving LOANS or CREDIT ENHANCEMENTS, 100% of construction costs are eligible for funding, with no local match required.

What matching funds are to be used for this project? (i.e. Federal State, MRF, Local, etc.)

LOCAL

To what extent are matching funds to be utilized, expressed as a percentage of anticipated CONSTRUCTION costs?

TEN PERCENT

6. Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a complete ban or partial ban of the use or expansion of use for the involved infrastructure? (Typical examples include weight limits, truck restrictions, and moratoriums or limitations on issuance of new building permits.) THE BAN MUST HAVE AN ENGINEERING JUSTIFICATION TO BE CONSIDERED VALID. Attach a copy of the document (ordinance, resolution, etc.) which imposes the ban.

COMPLETE BAN n/a

PARTIAL BAN \_\_\_\_\_

NO BAN \_\_\_\_\_

Will the ban be removed after the project is completed? YES \_\_\_\_\_ NO \_\_\_\_\_

7. What is the total number of existing users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? Use specific criteria such as households, traffic counts, ridership figures for public transit, daily users, etc., and equate to an equal measurement of users:

19,700 ADT

For roads and bridges, multiply current documented Average Daily Traffic by 1.2 occupants per car (I.T.E. estimated conversion factor) to determine users per day. Ridership figures for public transit must be documented. Where the facility currently has any restrictions or is partially closed, use documented traffic counts prior to restriction. For storm sewers, sanitary sewers, water lines, and other related facilities, multiply the number of households in the service area by four (4) to determine the approximate number of users per day.

8. The Ohio Public Works Commission requires that all jurisdictions applying for project funding develop a five year overall Capital Improvement Plan that shall be updated annually. The Plan is to include an inventory and condition survey of existing capital improvements, and a list detailing a schedule for capital improvements and/or maintenance. Both Five-Year Overall and Five-Year Issue Capital Improvement Plans are required.

Copies of these Plans are to be submitted to the District Integrating Committee at the same time the Project Application is submitted.

9. Is the infrastructure to be improved part of a facility that has regional significance? (Consider the number of jurisdictions served, size of service area, trip lengths, functional classification, and length of route.) Provide supporting information.

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

ADDITIONAL SUPPORT INFORMATION  
WOOSTER PIKE STORM SEWER REPLACEMENT

2. STATEMENT OF THE NATURE OF DEFICIENCY

THE EXISTING STORM SEWER SYSTEM IS INADEQUATE DUE TO AGE (40 PLUS YEARS) AND EXTREME DETERIORATION OF THE EXISTING CORRUGATED METAL PIPE.

THE INVERT OF THE SEWER IS COMPLETELY DETERIORATED WHICH IS CAUSING SOIL TO ERODE FROM BENEATH THE WALKS. THIS COULD CAUSE A SUDDEN AND CATASTROPHIC COLLAPSE OF THE WALKS AND BLOCKAGE OF THE STORM DRAINAGE SYSTEM. PAVEMENT. SUCH A COLLAPSE WOULD ENDANGER LIVES AND DAMAGE BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROPERTY.

THE ROADWAY/STORM SEWER FACILITY IS IN A COMMERCIAL AREA.  
THE ROADWAY SUPPORTS A VERY HIGH VOLUME OF TRAFFIC.

BLOCKAGE OF THE ROADWAY DUE TO A CATASTROPHIC COLLAPSE WOULD HAVE A LARGE FINANCIAL IMPACT ON THE COMMERCIAL ENTITIES LOCATED ALONG THIS ROADWAY AND TO THE TRAVELING PUBLIC.

3. PRELIMINARY ENGINEERING	60 DAYS
DETAILED ENGINEERING	30 DAYS
UTILITY COORDINATION	60 DAYS

4. THE PROPOSED INFRASTRUCTURE REPLACEMENT PROJECT WILL PROVIDE FOR:

A) RECONSTRUCTION OF THE STORM SEWER WILL HELP TO MAINTAIN THE VITALITY OF THE COMMERCIAL AREA ALONG THIS ROADWAY, THEREBY MAINTAINING A TAX BASE FOR THE VILLAGE;

B) REPLACING THE EXISTING CONDUIT WILL ENHANCE THE CAPACITY OF THE STORM SEWER SYSTEM; AND,

C) REPLACING THE EXISTING CONDUIT WILL PREVENT ANY SUDDEN AND/OR POTENTIALLY CATASTROPHIC COLLAPSE OF THE ROADWAY DUE TO SUBSURFACE EROSION CAUSED BY FAILURE OF THE STORM SEWER SYSTEM.

9. REGIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

WOOSTER PIKE IS A MAJOR EAST/WEST ARTERIAL CONNECTOR BETWEEN COLUMBIA PARKWAY AND THE EASTERN PART OF THE CINCINNATI METROPOLITAN AREA.

# STATE ISSUE 2 PROGRAM - ROUND 6

## LTIP PROGRAM - ROUND 5

FISCAL YEAR 1994 PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA - JULY 1, 1993 TO JUNE 30, 1994

ADOPTED BY THE DISTRICT 2 INTEGRATING COMMITTEE JULY 17, 1992

AMENDED BY THE DISTRICT 2 INTEGRATING COMMITTEE SEPTEMBER 18, 1992

JURISDICTION/AGENCY: FAIRFAX

NAME OF PROJECT: WOOSTER PIKE STORM SEWER

TOTAL POINTS FOR THIS PROJECT: 49

### NO. POINTS

10

- 1) If Issue 2/LTIP Funds are granted, when would the construction contract be awarded? (The Support Staff will assign points based on engineering experience.)

10 Points - Will be under contract by end of 1993

5 Points - Will be under contract by March 30, 1994

0 Points - Will not be under contract by March 30, 1994

16

- 2) What is the condition of the infrastructure to be replaced or repaired? For bridges, base condition on latest general appraisal and condition rating.

20 Points - Poor Condition

16 Points -

12 Points - Fair to Poor Condition

8 Points -

4 Points - Fair Condition

NOTE: If the infrastructure is in "good" or better condition it will NOT be considered for Issue 2/LTIP funding, unless it is a betterment project that will improve serviceability.

2

- 3) If the project is built, what will be its effect on the facility's serviceability?

10 Points - Significant effect (e.g., widen to and add lanes along entire project)  
8 Points - Moderate to significant effect  
6 Points - Moderate effect (e.g., widen exist. lanes)  
4 Points - Moderate to little effect  
2 Points - Little or no effect (e.g., street or bridge deck rehabilitation)

4

- 4) How important is the project to HEALTH, SAFETY, AND WELFARE of the public and the citizens of the District and/or service area?

10 Points - Highly significant importance, with substantial impact on all 3 factors  
8 Points - Considerably significant importance, with substantial impact on 2 factors OR noticeable impact on all 3 factors  
6 Points - Moderate importance, with substantial impact on 1 factor or noticeable impact on 2 factors  
4 Points - Minimal importance, with noticeable impact on 1 factor  
2 Points - No measurable impact

6

- 5) What is the overall economic health of the jurisdiction?

10 Points - Poor  
8 Points -  
6 Points - Fair  
4 Points -  
2 Points - Excellent

1

- 6) What matching funds are being committed to the project, expressed as a percentage of the TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST? Loan and Credit Enhancement projects automatically receive 5 points, and no match is required. All grant funded projects require a minimum of 10% matching funds.

5 Points - 50% or more  
4 Points - 40% to 49.99%  
3 Points - 30% to 39.99%  
2 Points - 20% to 29.99%  
1 Point - 10% to 19.99%

0

- 7) Has any formal action by a federal, state, or local government agency resulted in a partial or complete ban of the usage or expansion of the usage for the involved infrastructure? POINTS MAY ONLY BE AWARDED IF THE END RESULT OF THE PROJECT WILL CAUSE THE BAN TO BE LIFTED.

5 Points - Complete or significant ban  
3 Points - Partial or moderate ban  
0 Points - No ban of any kind

- 8) What is the total number of existing daily users that will benefit as a result of the proposed project? Appropriate criteria include current traffic counts, households served, when converted to a measurement of persons. Public transit users are permitted to be counted for roads and bridges, but only when certifiable ridership figures are provided.

5 Points - 10,000 or more  
4 Points - 7,500 to 9,999  
3 Points - 5,000 to 7,499  
2 Points - 2,500 to 4,999  
1 Point - 2,499 and under

2  
X

- 9) Does the infrastructure have REGIONAL impact? Consider origins and destinations of traffic, functional classification, size of service area, number of jurisdictions served, etc.

5 Points - Major impact (e.g., major multi-jurisdictional route, primary feed route to an Interstate, Federal - Aid Primary routes)  
4 Points -  
3 Points - Moderate impact (e.g., principal thoroughfares, Federal - Aid Urban routes)  
2 Points -  
1 Point - Minimal or no impact (e.g., cul-de-sacs, subdivision streets)

1

- 10) Has the jurisdiction enacted the optional \$5 license plate fee, an infrastructure levy, a user fee, or a dedicated tax for infrastructure?

2 Points - Two of the above  
1 Point - One of the above  
0 Points - None of the above

**ADDENDUM TO THE RATING SYSTEM  
DEFINITIONS**

**CRITERION 2 - CONDITION**

Poor - Condition is dangerous, unsafe or unusable

Fair to Poor - Condition is inadequate or substandard

Fair - Condition is average, not good or poor

**CRITERION 5 - ECONOMIC HEALTH**

The following factors are used to determine economic health:

- 1) Median per capita income
- 2) Per capita assessed valuation of the total community real estate and personal property
- 3) Poverty indicators
- 4) Effective tax rates
- 5) Total corporate debt as a percentage of assessed valuation
- 6) Municipal revenues and expenditures per capita

**CRITERION 9 - REGIONAL IMPACT**

- |                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Major impact -    | Primary water or sewer main serving an entire system     |
| Moderate impact - | Waterline or storm sewer serving only part of a system   |
| Minimal impact -  | Individual waterline or storm sewer not part of a system |